

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 506

CS 208 599

AUTHOR Eadie, Frank; And Others
TITLE The Origins of Fiction.
PUB DATE Aug 83
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (91st, Anaheim, CA, August 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; Child Development; Fiction; Influences; Narration; *Parent Child Relationship; Prereading Experience; *Reading Aloud to Others; *Reading Research; *Story Reading; *Story Telling; Young Children

ABSTRACT

The experiences of one child's storytelling events over a period of nine months were tape recorded in a study that examined which variables were the most important in the child's learning of narrative. The variables considered took into account the impact of different storytellers, different story genres, different interactions (kinds of parental and child response), the impact of the child's age (23 months), the length of the session, and the child's familiarity with the genre. Extensive analyses of the factor and contextual variables produced 12 clusters of adult-child behaviors, of which seven were dominated by the effects of genre, four by variables specific to the child, and two by parent-child interaction patterns. Of significance was that each of the adults (mother, father, and teacher) had a different impact on the style of the storytelling sessions. The father tended to be more authoritarian and yet allowed for a more emotional response. The mother was more progressively educative and yet required a more sober relationship. The teacher was a mixture of the mother's educative approach and the father's allowance for nonsense. Each of the genres themselves also created a different impact. The child was relatively more playful with stories (reading and telling and picture books) than with personal narratives, and had more fun in cotelling stories than in being told stories. There were also changes over time, with the child's emotionality and spontaneity of responses decreasing with age. (HOD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED249506

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this doc-
ument do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

THE ORIGINS OF FICTION

by

Frank Eadie, Brian Sutton-Smith and Mary Ann Magee
University of Pennsylvania

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Frank Eadie

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Within developmental psychology the major approaches to the study of narrative with children have been those that emphasized the structures of narrative (Sutton-Smith, 1981), the memory for plot structure (Rumelhart, 1977; Mandler & Johnson, 1977) or the interactional context within which narrating takes place (Ninio & Bruner, 1976). We know from theoretical works on narrative, however, that the possible complexity of the narrative event is much greater than these various studies would suggest (Mitchell, 1980).

The present study is an effort to consider a wider range of variables by taking into account the impact of different storytellers, different story genre (picture book, storybook, made up stories, personal experiences) different interactions (kinds of parental and kinds of child response), the impact of the child's age, the length of the session and the child's familiarity with the genre.

The empirical study of such variables has important implication for the debate over which variables are the most important in children's learning of narrative, a debate sometimes couched in terms of text oriented versus context oriented approaches. Not having a clear a priori stance in this debate, our interests focused on three large sets of relationships: those (a) between our behavioral codes (to be thought of as representing a text) and the differing contextual (environmental) variables mentioned above; those (b) between adult behaviors and child behaviors (in which case the

CS 208 599

question of which represents text and which context is an open one), and, finally (being good developmentalists), those (c) between the child's text and the fluid context represented by the passage of time.

The present study like that of Ninio and Bruner (1976) attempts an exploration of some of the issues in this area by a study of the way in which one child experienced storytelling events over a period of nine months.

METHOD

The adults (mother, father and teacher) involved were all of middle socioeconomic status, lived in an urban, middle class neighborhood and were university graduates. They were told that we wanted audio cassette-taped samples of their story-related sessions with the child and wished them to continue taping until such time as the child proved capable of telling a story herself. Over a nine month period there were 28 sessions when the parents chose to turn on the tape recorder which resided throughout on their kitchen table. The shortest session recorded lasted only 70 seconds, while the longest was 37 minutes and 25 seconds. The average length was 11 minutes and 25 seconds.

Category Analysis

Extensive analyses of the protocols from the 5 hours and 20 minutes of these 28 sessions yielded 21 categories for adult behavior, and 29 categories for the child behavior. These categories are listed in Table 1. Each category is followed by the percentage of its usage out of the total verbalization time. As the child was only 23 months old at the beginning, much of her discourse was unintelligible except to the parents and the one

investigator (Magee) who had known the baby since birth and was a frequent visitor to the home. It was not possible therefore to arrive at independent measures of reliability from the tapes alone. Instead a consensus was reached with the parents that the protocols typed by Maggee did indeed reflect the sessions proceedings, and a consensus was reached amongst the investigators that the codes derived from those protocols were being correctly applied.

All protocols were gone through, and consensus was reached about the categorization of each response before proceeding. Again, much of the time this agreement depended upon the ability of Magee to provide the context for the words in the protocol, so that ultimately a great deal still depended on her special access to the foreign language of this young child. Perhaps the validity and non-random character of these codings is best assessed by the good sense of the results that follow.

INSERT TABLE 1

In addition to scoring the responses in each session, the sessions were themselves categorized on the basis of:

- (a) the person doing the storytelling or reading
- (b) the literary genre involved
- (c) other persons present

In eight of the sessions either the storyteller or genre changed during the session. As a result those sessions were broken up into separate episodes and analyzed separately as in Table 2.

INSERT TABLE 2

Factor Analysis

Composite variables computed from both the frequency and duration of the 21 adult and 29 child categories were submitted to separate principle components analyses with oblimin rotations. These analyses yielded the 8 adult factors and 12 child factors shown in Table 3. The adult factors

INSERT TABLE 3

were then correlated with the child factors, and all of these were correlated in turn with the variables, contained in Table 2, which have to do with the character of the sessions, the storytellers, and the genre. From this set of correlations twelve relatively distinct clusters were delineated, each based upon one of the eight adult factors or the four relatively independent child factors.

RESULTS

Although the parents did most of the talking or reading in these sessions, taking up 73.5% of the recorded time, the character of the sessions was more like a continued conversation than a one sided presentation by the parents. There was a great deal of turn taking and the

average turn was only 2.88 seconds in length, with the average for the adults being 3.45 seconds and for the child 1.92 seconds.

What is immediately obvious in Table 1 is the hierarchical character of the adult responses and the widely dispersed character of the child's responses. 25% of all response time by adults across these five hours involves reading to the child, and each of the following categories takes up at least an additional 5%: co-telling stories; talking about matters out of the immediate context of the storying; telling made up stories; making an affective response to the child, and asking the child questions about what she has said.

In contrast, the child's longest response time is in the playful transformation of themes, and this constitutes only 2% of the total time. This response is followed by answering questions (1.9%); becoming a story teller (1.9%); using personal narratives (1.8%) etc. As Werner might have put it, the adults are much more focussed in these encounters and the child is much more labile (1957).

Perhaps the most significant result of the factor analysis was the strong evidence of the independence of our various codes. The two sets of factors derived accounted for only approximately 75 percent of the variance in each of the two sets of data. The fact that fully 20 factors were necessary to account for 50 variables suggests again that the behaviors being coded were markedly independent of each other. None of the factors contain large loadings from more than three codes. Six are made up primarily of a single code. This finding is still further confirmed by the fact that among the more than 600 intercorrelations between pairs of adult and pairs of child behavior codes, only one exceeds .70 and only three are larger than .60.

Turning our attention now to the twelve clusters derived from the factors and the contextual variables, we find that although adult behaviors tend to be independent of other adult behaviors and child behaviors are independent of other child behaviors, that there are clear relationships between some adult behaviors and some child behaviors. More specifically, seven of the eight adult factors are significantly related to one or more child factors, while, conversely, only eight of the twelve child factors are so related to adult factors. This result suggests that, in addition to its greater lability, the child's behavior is somewhat more independent of the adults' behavior than vice versa.

From another perspective, the results show that seven of the clusters are dominated by the effects of genre, four by variables specific to the child, and two by parent-child interaction patterns. One might read these results to suggest that in this study the effects of the text (the genre) controlled better than half of what was occurring in this analysis and the effects of the social context (the people) controlled the remainder. More specifically adult factors 1 and 4 clearly involve social context variables, but adult factors 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and child factor 10 are clearly related to specific genres. Child factors 2, 7, and 11 stand apart.

(A) GENRE CLUSTERS

(1) The Picture Book Genre. This cluster includes adult factor 2 (Dramatizing Text) and child factors 1 (Mastering Text), (.40, $p < .01$) and 8 (Imaginative Enactment), (.35, $p < .02$). It generally involved use of a picture book (.45, $p < .01$), and it decreased with age. Picture books tended to be used more when the child was younger, and the child responded

imaginatively to them. This kind of playful responding decreases as the child grows older, however.

(2) Improvisational Story Telling. This cluster includes adult factor 3 (Playful Co-Telling) with child factor 5, Contributing to Story and Negativism, (.28, $p=.05$) and with child factor 8, Initial Framing, (.29, $p<.05$). The child's negativism is apparently a way of responding to the adults' use of humor in the situation. This kind of storytelling often occurred with material unfamiliar to the child ($-.23$, $p<.10$). These relationships occur in story telling time (.50, $p<.01$) but not during story reading time ($-.45$, $p<.01$).

(3) Story Book Reading. This cluster associated adult factor 5 (Clarification and Framing) with child factor 4, Nonsense and Relating to Events, (.29, $p<.04$), and with child factor 12, Playful Transformation (.34, $p<.02$). It is related to story book reading (.35, $p<.01$) but negatively to personal narrative ($-.46$, $p<.01$). It is strongly (.43, $p<.01$) related to the child's familiarity with the story. This could also be called a "marker" factor. The provision of initial and terminal markers, or "framing," is most important in conventional story telling and has been much emphasized in conventional folk story literatures. But from the rest of this analysis we see that such framing is not so important in the other genre. Interestingly, the familiarity and clear staging of these stories permit much nonsense and playfulness from the child, at least in these social contexts.

(4) Personal Narratives. This cluster associates the adult factor 6 (Personal Narrative) negatively with child factor 1 (Mastering of Story), ($-.29$, $p<.03$), with child factor 8 (Imaginative Enactment), ($-.30$, $p<.04$) with child factor 9 (Interpreting the Text), ($-.36$, $p<.01$) and with child

factor 12 (Playful Transformation), ($-.31, p<.03$). It is associated with the personal narrative genre ($.62, p<.01$) and not with the story book genre ($-.33, p<.01$). It is also associated with Jenny in the story telling role ($.37, p<.01$). Apparently she tells her narratives in the context of adult personal narrative telling. They are serious occasions allowing for no side play or interpretation, and are, as we have shown elsewhere, very much concerned with some of the traumatic events in her own life (Magee & Sutton-Smith, 1983).

(5) Story Telling. This cluster is similar to that of #2 above but refers to the adult doing it alone rather than co-telling it with the child. It includes adult factor 7 (Made Up story) and does not correlate strongly with any of the child factors. This seems to be a more serious form than the more playful co-telling of factor #3. It correlates with the storytelling genre ($.54, p<.01$) and negatively with reading from the story book ($-.40, p<.01$).

(6) Framing the Story. This is adult factor 8 (Initial Framing) and in some ways resembles cluster 3. It relates negatively to child factor 5 (Contributing to Story and Negativism), ($-.50, p<.01$), negatively to child factor 6 (Storytelling), ($-.40, p<.01$), and positively to child factor 12 (Playful Transformation), ($.33, p<.03$). It correlates non-significantly with picture books ($.21$). It relates positively to the number of segments ($.40, p<.01$) and less so to time spent talking ($.30, p<.04$), which suggests that there are more interactions in these sessions than is customary. There is a near significant relationship to the mother as reader ($.23, p<.09$). This appears to be a slightly more sober cluster than number 3 which also has playful transformation but more nonsense and child contributions.

(B) SOCIAL CLUSTERS

(7) Didactic Cluster. Adult factor 1 (Interaction with Child) relates to child factor 9 (Interpreting Text) (.70, $p < .01$). This factor clearly captures the kind of scaffolding relationship discussed in the Bruner and Ninio paper of 1976. When the adult asks questions, responds affectively, volunteers explanations, and gives initial framing, then the child answers those questions, makes interpretations and exclaims in response to the text. Everything as it should be in a good classroom. In the present case, however, this relationship most often occurred when the child was herself the narrator (.52, $p < .01$) and was less likely to happen with the father (-.29, $p < .04$). Apparently the women were more didactically sustaining of the child's initiative than was the father.

(8) Role Reversal. Adult Factor 4 (Role Reversal) relates to child factor 3 (Role Reversal) (.77, $p < .01$) and child factor 6 (Storytelling) (.36, $p < .01$). There is a decrease in this phenomenon with increasing child age (-.31, $p < .03$) and with the number of the session (-.37, $p < .01$). The mother encouraged this behavior (.29, $p < .10$), but the father did not (-.47, $p < .01$). Both this and the prior factor are negatively related to the father as teller. They are both educational styles fostered by the women; both are relatively "Rogerian" in emphasis, but seriously so.

(C) CHILD CLUSTERS

(9) Child Factor 2, Heightened Affect. includes exclamatory emotional responses, laughter after the text, intense enactment of affect etc. It is clearly an emotional cluster. It relates negatively to the mother (-.31, $p < .03$) and approaches a significant positive relationship for the teacher (.23, $p < .08$). It is associated with the story book (.28, $p < .05$) but decreases with age (-.28, $p < .05$).

(10) Child Factor 7, Plot Involvement. is somewhat positive with story book reading (.23, $p < .10$), but negative with personal narratives (-.31, $p < .05$). It is strongly related to length of session (.45), number of segments (.43), and amount of talking time (.50, all with $p < .01$), less positively with the child's familiarity with the material (.24, $p < .08$), and with father (.26, $p < .06$), and negatively with mother (-.28, $p < .05$).

(11) Child Factor 10. Pretending with Story, is the only one of the "child" clusters closely associated with a specific genre - in this case, Storytelling (.45, $p < .01$) - and is negatively correlated with story book reading (-.29, $p < .04$) and with age (-.31, $p < .03$). The child does less of this with age, just as she is less emotionally expressive with age (Table 5, #9 above).

(12) Child Factor 11. Affirmation. This appears to refer to the child being agreeable to adult interpretations and tends not to occur when the child is doing the story reading/telling (-.35, $p < .02$). It is modestly associated (.23, $p < .10$) with the adult story dramatization factor (#2).

Looking, now, more carefully at the evidence from the above clusters, it becomes clear that the parents and teacher as narrator/readers have a profound influence on the child. Both of the social clusters, the framing cluster, and two of the child clusters include correlations with one or more of the adults. Even more impressively, eight of the twelve child factors correlate above .20 with at least one of the adults. Only factors 6, 9, 11, and 12 do not. If we deal just with the correlations between the codes in Table 1, these differences can be sharpened when set out as in Table 4. It seems clear from that table that the father is a more authoritarian but dramatic and playful narrator and allows for more nonsense on the child's part. The emotional quality of the sessions is more

lighthearted. The mother on the other hand sponsors a more progressive educational relationship with role reversal etc., but the emotional quality appears to be somewhat more sober. The teacher is like the mother but in addition as we saw from the #9 cluster, she seemed to be associated with wilder behavior, perhaps because of her special visiting relationship with this child. (The teacher is investigator Magee.)

INSERT TABLE 4

Similarly the age changes over the 9 months can be clarified by Table 5, which shows the parents decreasing their didacticism with age and the child decreasing her emotionality and perhaps her spontaneity.

INSERT TABLE 5

DISCUSSION

It is difficult to know what to make of our many figures as there is little with which to compare them. The nearest relevant study, that by Ninio and Bruner (1976), was of an English child over a year younger using video tape recording. Their focus was only upon the child's acquisition of labelling to picture books and of the way in which the mother carefully scaffolded the child's responses to that end with her own attention getting processes, queries and feedback. Ninio and Bruner spoke of it as a "ritualized dialogue." Their situation appears to have

been considerably more limited and didactic than the present one, though whether this was due to the heavy presence of the experimenters and the experimental contraptions in their case, the cultural differences, the children's age differences, or the storyteller's sex we do not know.

Given all these differences we believe the predominant role played by the adults in both cases to be very significant. In the Ninio and Bruner case over 90% of the adults' responses were directed to a didactic end, and even in the present more open case, we estimate that about 60% of the adults' responses were similarly didactic. Again, both studies had in common the rapid fire, turn-taking exchange between parent and child throughout with the average response length with their younger child being 1.49 seconds and in ours, as we have seen, being 2.88 seconds. We infer that their concept of a scaffolded dialogue is a reasonable one for this kind of literary goings on between parents and children in the Western cultural situation, especially when the parents are subject to some outside monitoring by investigators as in both of these cases.

Our data, however, attest to a far more heterogeneous, complex and, under some circumstances, playful dialogue. Quite different patterns emerge depending upon which adult(s) is interacting with the child, which storying genre is being used, and, to a lesser extent, how old and experienced the child and parents are. It is clear from the correlations that the child tuned into the adult performances and expectations giving appropriate and imitative responses (and, at times, leading the way), anticipating the plot, acting out parts, transforming the plot, and reversing roles with mother. In addition, however, a good deal of her

behavior is relatively independent of the adult behavior and of genre.

The adults, too, adopt different behaviors at different times and with different genres and differ among themselves as to preferred modes. Father talks more, dramatizes more, co-tells more, and responds with greater affect. Mother maintains a cool, didactic demeanor but encourages role reversal and questioning. The teacher is rather like mother but encounters greater affect and more storytelling.

Over time, the sessions appear to become somewhat more formal and routinized as, presumably, the child becomes better socialized into the correct procedures. Dramatizing, repeating, and questioning decrease on the part of the adults, while the child becomes less affectively labile and more cognitively competent.

CONCLUSION

The present study of one child over a nine month period limited as it must be to the particular circumstances involved give support to the Ninio and Bruner (1976) analysis of the immense amount of involvement of some modern middle class parents in the development of literacy in their children. The various analyses show that in attempting to interpret the relevant elements involved in a child's learning of narrative behavior, the following variables were all of significance. Each of the adults, mother, father and teacher, had a different impact on the style of the storytelling sessions. The father tended to be more authoritarian and yet allowed for a more emotional response. The mother was more progressively educative and yet required a more sober relationship. The teacher was a mixture of the

mother's educative approach and the father's allowance for nonsense. Each of the genres themselves also created different impacts. The child was relatively more playful with stories (reading and telling and picture books) than with personal narratives, and was more funful in cotelling stories than in being told stories. There were also changes over time, with the child decreasing both the emotionality and the spontaneity of its responses with age.

The much more circumscribed results of Ninio and Bruner (1976) which explain the events observed in terms of a social dialogue alone, can be seen as appropriate only within a single genre.

At the very least, the complexity of the present account, the demonstration of the many contingencies that enter into these narrative sessions, argues forcefully against those more narrow approaches which would attempt to interpret narrative solely in terms of plot structures, or solely in terms of cognitive factor, or solely in terms of parental influence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Magee M.A. & Sutton-Smith B. The art of storytelling: How do children learn it? Young Children, 1983, 38, 4-12.
- Mandler, J. & Johnson, N. Rememberances of things parsed: Story structure and recall. Cognitive Psychology, 1977. 9, 111-115.
- Mitchell, W.J. On Narrative. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Ninio, A. & Bruner, J. The achievement and antecedents of labeling. Journal of Child Language. 1976. 5, 1-15.
- Rumelhart, . Understanding and summarizing brief stories. In D. LaBerge & S. Samuels, eds. Basic Processes in Reading: Perception and Comprehension. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Laurence Earlebaum, 1977.
- Sutton-Smith, B. The folkstories of children. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.
- Werner, H. Comparative psychology of mental development. New York: International University Press, 1957.

TABLE 1: PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL VERBALIZATION TIME

PARENT CATEGORIES	
1. Reading or elaborating text	25.00
2. Telling made up story	5.54
3. Co-telling story (interpretations, incorporation, etc.)	7.99
4. Affective responses to child (laughter, exclamations, confirmations)	5.15
5. Questions on text	3.21
6. Questions on what child has said	5.30
7. Repetitions	2.77
8. Answers to questions (explanations)	.26
9. Reversing roles	.34
10. Disagreeing (negating)	.25
11. Dramatizing text or story	.29
12. Play	3.08
13. Nonsense	.03
14. Volunteered explanations	1.32
15. Personal narratives	1.65
16. Framing (initial)	2.08
17. Framing (terminal)	.63
18. Tone framing	.14
19. Out of context	8.02
20. Directives	.37
21. Fill-ins	.19

TABLE I (Continued)
CHILD CATEGORIES

Responsive to Text

22. Repeats own or other statements about text	.80
23. Answers questions	1.86
24. Anticipates what will happen next	.35
25. Names events or persons in text on own initiative	1.46
26. Asks questions	1.38
27. Negativism	.65
28. Relates to events from own experience (live or from book)	.64
29. Affirms or agrees	.86

Affective Responses to Text

30. Laughter at text	.77
31. Exclamatory response to text	.31
32. Exclamatory novel response, slang etc... (Yea Yea)	.44
33. Emotional response	.03

Inventions to Text--cognitive

34. Makes own interpretations	1.40
35. Invents emotions that are suggested by text, picture, or are not there	.12
36. Answers questions on own interpretation of story	.25

Playful responses in role of actor

37. Enacts characters or actions of text	.59
38. Enacts affects with intense affect (squeals, songs, etc.)	.62
39. Invents emotions that are not stated (or are suggested)	.01
40. Playful transformations of any themes	2.03
41. Puts self in story	.66
42. Nonsense	.39

Responses in the role of storyteller

43. Contributes to storyteller role with parent	1.24
44. Becomes storyteller with story of own	1.89
45. Becomes storyteller with character impersonations	1.31
46. Assumes regular storyteller role, asking questions, etc: using affect	1.38
47. Uses storyteller announcements or framing techniques	1.50
48. Reverses role so that the parent becomes the listener or child	.34
49. Personal narratives	1.76
50. Out of field conversations	1.32

TABLE 2: CONTEXTUAL AND OTHER VARIABLES WITH RELEVANT STATISTICS

Contextual Variables		
Genre	# of Episodes	Mean Length of Episodes (mins.)
-----	-----	-----
Story Book	18	6:18.6
Story Telling	9	8:57.2
Personal Narrative	6	1:41.0
Picture Book	3	12:53.3
Child's Familiarity with Material		

First Encounter	13	3:53.6
Probably Some Familiarity	11	8:55.9
Definitely Familiar	12	7:50.3
Story Teller/Reader		

Father	21	7:14.6
Mother & Father	5	3:52.0
Mother	4	11:38.3
Child	4	2:41.0
Teacher	2	7:05.0
Social Structure		

Father Only	21	7:02.0
Mother & Father	11	6:36.6
Mother Only	2	4:10.0
Teacher & Father	2	7:05.0
Other Variables		
	Range	Mean
	-----	-----
Episode Number	1 - 36	
Age of Child	23.0 - 32.0 Mon.	28.1
Episode Length	0:53 - 37:25 M:n.	6:44.9
Number of Utterances	8 - 374	100.6
Mean Length of Utterances	1.45 - 31.88 Sec.	2.883

TABLE 3: FACTORS DERIVED FROM BEHAVIORAL CODES

		ADULT FACTORS	
Factors		Behavioral Categories	
No.	Name	Loading >.707	Loading >.316,<.707
1	INTERACTION WITH CHILD	4. affective response to child 5. questions on text 14. volunteered explanation	16. initial framing
2	DRAMATIZING TEXT OR STORY	11. dramatizing text or story 20. directives	21. fill-ins
3	PLAYFUL CO-TELLING	18. tone framing 3. co-telling story 12. play	1. reading or elaborating text(-)
4	ROLE REVERSAL	9. reversing roles 8. answers to questions	7. repetitions 5. questions on text
5	CLARIFICATION & FRAMING	6. question on child's utterance 17. terminal framing	16. initial framing 19. out-of-context conversation(-) 1. reading or elaborating text(-)
6	PERSONAL NARRATIVE	15. personal narrative	10. disagreeing (negating) 1. reading or elaborating text(-)
7	MADE-UP STORY	2. telling made-up story	19. out-of-context conversation(-) 1. reading or elaborating text(-)
8	INITIAL FRAMING		16. initial framing 19. out-of-context conversation(-) 3. co-telling story 8. answers to questions

TABLE 3 (Continued)

CHILD FACTORS

Factors		Behavioral Categories	
No.	Name	Loading >.707	Loading >.316,<.707
1	MASTERING OF STORY	25. names events/characters on own initiative 22. repeats statement on text	47. uses announcements or framing techniques 34. makes own interpretation 27. negativism 49. personal narrative(-)
2	HEIGHTENED AFFECT	32. exclamatory/emotional novel response 30. laughter at text	38. enacts affect w/ intensity 23. answers questions 31. exclamatory response to text
3	ROLE REVERSAL	48. reverses roles 26. asks questions 23. answers questions	
4	NONSENSE & RELATING TO EVENTS	42. nonsense 28. relates to events(real or in book)	
5	CONTRIBUTING TO STORY & NEGATIVISM	43. contributes to storytelling 27. negativism	49. personal narrative(-)
6	STORYTELLING	46. assumes storytelling role using affect	47. uses announcements or framing techniques
7	PLOT INVOLVEMENT	24. anticipates plot 41. puts self in story	
8	IMAGINATIVE ENACTMENT	38. enacts affect w/ intensity 35. invents emotions 37. enacts characters or actions from text	32. exclamatory/emotional novel response
9	INTERPRETING TEXT	36. answers questions on own interpretation	34. makes own interpretation 31. exclamatory response to text
10	PRETENDING WITH TEXT	45. storytelling w/ character impersonation 44. telling own story 31. exclamatory response to text	
11	AFFIRMATION	29. affirms or agrees	50. out-of-context conversation(-) 34. makes own interpretation
12	PLAYFUL TRANSFORMATION	40. playful transformations	49. personal narrative(-)

TABLE 4: VARIATION IN ADULT AND CHILD RESPONSE AS A FUNCTION OF NARRATOR

ADULT BEHAVIOR		CHILD BEHAVIOR	
Father as narrator			
Reversal of roles	-.47	Reverses roles	-.35
Repetitions	-.34	Asks questions	.34
Length of session	-.33	Laughter at text	.32
Affective responses	.29	Nonsense	.32
Dramatizing text	.29	Anticipates	.31
Mother as narrator			
Co-telling	-.29	Laughter at text	-.43
Reversal of role (w/o F)	.29	Anticipates	-.42
Terminal framing	.27	Intense affect	-.35
Questions on what child has said	.25	Exclamatory response	-.34
Repetitions (w/o F)		Asks questions (w/o F)	
		Answers question (w/o F)	
		Playful transformations (w/o F)	
		Reverses roles (w/o F)	
		Personal narrative (w/o F)	
Teacher as narrator			
Questions on text	.39	Enacts characters or actions from text	.41
Volunteered explanations	.36	Assumes regular storyteller role	.33
		Answers questions	

TABLE 5: VARIABLES THAT DECREASE IN IMPORTANCE OR INCREASE
IN IMPORTANCE OVER THE TWENTY-EIGHT SESSIONS

For the adults

Decrease		Increase	
Directives	-.39	Out of context remarks	.32
Repetitions	-.38		
Dramatizing	-.38		
Answers to questions	-.35		

For the child

Exclamatory responses to text	-.60	Answers questions on own interpretations of story	.35
Invents emotion to text	-.47		
Exclamatory novel responses	-.35		
Enacts intense affect	-.32		

ABSTRACT

Interactions of a two year old girl with her parents and/or teacher in situations involving the reading or telling of narratives were studied using a set of 50 behavioral codes. Audio tape-recordings were made of 28 sessions in the child's home during the period she was 23 to 32 months of age. Adult and child verbalizations were coded separately for each session and the results were factor analyzed, yielding twelve child and eight adult factors.

Adult and child factors were correlated with each other and with characteristics of the session such as genre (picture book, story book, made up story, and personal experience), adult(s) present, etc. From these correlations twelve clusters were derived. Seven clusters represent behavioral patterns related to specific genres; four are dominated by child behavior factors, and two - didactic interaction and role reversal - involve parent-child interaction patterns.

Results suggest that for this child there is no single "narrative process." Her behavior varied systematically with genre and with the social context. With increasing age her behavior became less emotionally labile and more appropriate, but much of it remained independent of the variables studied. Adult behavior differed significantly from one person to another and was generally more predictable than the child's.